

TO: Chief, IMSS

FROM: Chief, Procurement Team CLAS

SUBJECT: Weekly Status Report - Week Ending 3 July 1987

1. Received 5 more of the Purchasing canned reports. Rich has indicated that most of his clients are not using these reports. The clients have designed their own reports to meet their specific needs.

2. In order to prototype 1.2 AP and Purchasing have agreed to set the default Payment Terms at the System Level for "NET 30" with the capability of redefining Terms at the P.O. and invoice levels. Also, that the "Discount Terms" will not have a system default, but will be defined at the P.O. level.

3. The "Matching" for payment would be defined at the vendor level in 1.2 (this would not be practical in the real world because our vendor would be 4 times the size, as each vendor would have to be identified 4 times, also this could lead to confusing as to which vendor the P.O. is to be assigned), 1.3 "Matching" can be defined at the P.O. level. Our current system has 3 types of payment as follows:

a. "Fast Pay" would be a 2-way match in 1.2 and 1.3 (P.O. line = invoice line).

b. "Certificate of Conformance" would be a 2-way match in 1.2, but need a way of conveying to AP that the Certificate is required. Purchasing has a field for this information, but the information is not displayed on the invoice screen in 1.2 or 1.3.

c. "Other" in our current system is being researched to identify what type of matching is required as well as what additional information must be conveyed to AP.

3. It appears at this time the only way to identify the freight charges to AP in 1.2 is to have freight as a separate P.O. line item. It appears that 1.3 does have the capability to define freight without it being a P.O. line item. Rich is preparing a 1.3 scenario of the requisition-P.O.-receiving-payment.

last it doesn't really matter except we must be consistent on all contracts) will be the line item that will contain all the dollar information that AP will match against. The item will be nonstock with the quantity order field being used to show the total % of work contracted (it should always be 100%), the unit price will reflect 1/100 of the contract value so that the total price quantity will be order quantity x unit price, then the system will calculate the price as the total value of the contract.

5. are developing a scenario for the requisition process.

STAT

6. spent 7 hours with Purchasing this week. Next week he will be here on Wednesday.

STAT

STAT

29 June 1987

TO: Chief, IMSS

FROM: Chief, Procurement Team CLAS

SUBJECT: Weekly Status Report - Week Ending 26 June 1987

1. Received a successful run (hardcopy) of 19 more of the Purchasing Application's canned reports.
2. Continued to explore the differences between 1.2 and 1.3 screens. The Purchasing Application in 1.3 is so large that it is in four (4) segments (system; vendor; P.O.s; and Receiving).
3. Continued to explore the Blanket and Master Order release processing.
4. Purchasing needs a means for conveying to AP freight charges when applicable for the payment of freight charges. Explored the user defined fields non-ext type and non-ext cost. The documentation states this is user defined, but we found that if the type of F was used that the cost would appear on the receiving screen. So far have not found the cost appearing on any of the AP invoice screens. Rich is researching this issue.

STAT

